

office; 70 of these statements raised legal or constitutional objections. President George W. Bush has issued 157 signing statements; 122 of these statements have contained some type of constitutional challenge or objection. Because it's reasonable to assume that future Presidents will continue this practice, Congress should act now to pass legislation to ensure proper understanding and disclosure of these signing statements.

The American Bar Association recently examined the issue of presidential signing statements and appointed the Task Force on Presidential Signing Statements and the Separation of Powers Doctrine. That task force issued a report urging Congress to "enact legislation requiring the President to promptly submit to Congress an official copy of all signing statements he issues . . . to submit to Congress a report setting forth in full the reasons and legal basis for the statement." The ABA also recommended that "such submissions be available in a publicly accessible database."

Mr. Speaker, the bill that I have introduced would require the President to transmit copies of the signing statements to congressional leadership within 3 days of issuance; require signing statements to be published in the Federal Register; third, require executive staff to testify on the meaning and justification for presidential signing statements at the request of the House or the Senate Judiciary Committee; and, fourth, provide that no moneys may be authorized or expended to implement any law accompanied by a signing statement if any provision of the law is violated.

Mr. Speaker, because it's important that we preserve the provision of power in our government and public understanding of our Nation's laws, I hope many of my colleagues will consider cosponsoring this legislation, H.R. 5993.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to ask God to continue to bless our men and women in uniform and ask God to continue to bless the families, and may God continue to bless America.

CONGRESSIONAL WAR POWERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Warren Christopher and James Baker released a groundbreaking report on the powers of the Congress and the White House about declaring war.

The Constitution is clear that only Congress has the right to declare war. Not only that, but Congress is granted the power of the purse. We in the Congress decide when it's appropriate to enter into armed conflict and then fulfill our commitment by fully funding and protecting our troops.

The publication may sound like dry stuff, another commission with another report. But that's not the case.

The fact that this report even needed to be written is noteworthy, however. It's noteworthy on its very own. Who would have thought that Members of Congress would need to be reminded of our constitutional duties? But the Baker-Christopher report is absolutely necessary, particularly now, as the administration's drumbeat for war with Iran builds.

We have seen over the past years how some have exploited the so-called war on terror to mean war with anyone who does not agree with America. We have heard it before: "If you're not with us, you're against us." Some even question the patriotism of those of us who have spoken up in opposition to some of the misguided policies of the White House, policies over the Iraq occupation, the loss of civil rights and liberties in the name of security, just as an example.

Recently, the New Yorker Magazine revealed that the administration sought up to \$400 million to fund a major escalation of covert operations against Iran, described in a presidential finding—my colleague was just talking about those—signed by President Bush and designed to destabilize the country's religious leadership.

Mr. Speaker, you don't need a secret decoder ring to know what that means. How often does a country spend hundreds of millions of dollars to declare peace with another nation?

Congress must assert itself. We can't just be waiting around to be "consulted." Consulting, not an open hearing or floor debate, is exactly what got us where we are today. I just don't think that we can sit back and wait for the executive branch to come down here to us and ask our permission.

This Congress, and the American people, will not stand for another war. We must strengthen our diplomatic efforts and work at it 24 hours a day. This is not something we can wait until the next administration takes over or until the current one forces our hand.

Negotiating with Iran's leaders may not be the ideal situation for some, but for others and most of us know it is the best opportunity that we have. Wouldn't it be nice if we could only talk to our friends? Well, that's not the way it is. We don't need to talk to our friends. We have to talk to those with whom we have differences. We have to talk to our enemies. That's the only way we are going to bring about any kind of disarmament and any kind of nonproliferation because talking to friends won't bring about human rights. It certainly won't bring about regional stability. We must have dialogue with Iran and we must do it now.

□ 1915

ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on both sides of the aisle, Demo-

crats and Republicans, we realize that we need to start looking at every source of energy that we can come up with; solar, wind. Every kind. We need to move toward new forms of transportation; hybrid cars and other vehicles, maybe hydrogen-powered cars.

But in addition to that, while this transition from fossil fuels is taking place to these new technologies, we need to drill for oil. We need to be energy independent. We need to use such things as coal shale and offshore drilling, and drilling in Alaska, the ANWR, in order to get the oil that is necessary for us to move and become energy independent, and we can do that. But this Congress and the Senate, this House and the Senate, really needs to get together and come up with a plan that covers all of these things. If we don't start drilling for oil and using fossil fuel more efficiently in this country, we are going to have a severe problem.

The Iranians just fired some test missiles the other day. They did that in response to the Israelis flying about a hundred war planes down the Mediterranean for a distance that was pretty close to Tehran's distance from Israel. I think they are both sending signals. The head of the air force for the Iranians said that if there was any kind of an act of war toward them, they would sink ships in the Persian Gulf.

Twenty percent of the world oil goes through the Persian Gulf. You sink two ships in the Gulf of Hormuz and you're going to have chaos. We get as much as 40 percent of our oil from that region. If anything like that occurs, and as long as Iran keeps working toward their nuclear goals of building a nuclear weapon, the threat of war is definitely there.

Israel has been threatened with extinction by the Iranian leaders, Ahmadinejad, the President, and so the threat of a conflict is definitely there. The United States economically would be devastated if we weren't prepared for that eventuality because we don't have the energy here necessary to keep this economy moving.

The best way to make sure that doesn't happen is to use every source of energy we can come up with. While we are transitioning to these other forms of energy like air, wind, like solar, like hybrid cars, like coal shale, like hydrogen-powered cars, all those things, while we are moving toward those, which is going to take probably at least 10 years, or longer, some people say as many as 20, we need to have the energy to keep this country afloat without depending on Saudi Arabia, the Middle East, Venezuela and the Communist leader down there, Mr. Chavez. We need to move toward energy independence. The American people are paying between \$4 and \$5 a gallon for oil.

The Fourth of July parades just took place and I know that all of my colleagues heard from their constituents: Do something about the price of gasoline. The best thing we can do is start

drilling and looking for energy in America. I believe, and I think many experts believe, that if we start drilling in America and make a movement toward energy independence, you will see the price of oil drop very rapidly and, along with it, the price of gasoline.

But as long as we stand around here and don't do anything, we run the threat of a real economic chaos in this country because we aren't prepared to be dealing with our own energy problems if we can't get the oil from Venezuela and from other parts of the world, like Saudi Arabia. We are just not prepared for it.

We have the energy in this country and we are not drilling for it. We are sending as much as \$500 million a day, a day, to Saudi Arabia and Venezuela for oil that we have right here in this country. We could keep that money at home, we could create more jobs while we are coming up with alternative sources of energy. But we are not doing it.

So I say to my Democrat colleagues again tonight, and I will be down here day after day and week after week saying, Let's get together and solve this problem.

I saw that the popularity of the Congress is now down to 7 percent. You know why? The American people are fed up with us not doing anything. We need to get together and solve this energy problem. We need to have energy independence. And we need to start doing it right now.

Remember what I said. If a conflict breaks out over there, all of us are going to be sorry that we didn't do something about it, about dealing with energy here at home.

Energy independence. Drill in America.

ANGLO-IRAQI TREATY OF 1930

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the reports out of Iraq these days make 2008 sound an awful lot like 1930. That's when the British strong-armed a so-called treaty to take control of Iraq's oil wealth. And it remained that way for decades until the people in the Middle East nationalized their oil wealth to end outside control. But western oil interests and the neocons have wanted it back ever since.

War Secretary Donald Rumsfeld may have said that invading Iraq had nothing to do with oil, but the announcement that western oil companies would get what they have lusted for says otherwise.

And editorial cartoonist Rob Tornoe of politicker.com summed up the world view the other day in a cartoon displayed right here next to me. He spoke truth to power with one compelling image. He says all at once that this entire war, its tragic casualties and immense cost, was all about oil.

As so many suspected all along, Secretary of State Rice tried to claim that the U.S. Government played no role whatsoever in securing sweetheart oil deals for Iraq's sweet crude oil. But the New York Times reported in a front page story, "A group of American advisers led by a small State Department team played an integral part in drawing up contracts between the Iraq Government and five major western oil companies."

The immense oil reserves beneath Iraq are the world's second largest, and western oil companies want them, just as they did 78 years ago. And like 1930, they plan to permanently occupy Iraq. To remove any doubt from the minds of the American people, I would like to enter into the RECORD the entire Anglo-Iraqi Treaty of 1930.

Let's look at Article 5. It says that maintaining order inside Iraq is the primary responsibility of the Iraq Government. But then it immediately says that Iraq recognizes and accepts Britain's role inside Iraq and grants Britain the right to build air bases and maintain military forces inside Iraq.

That is exactly what the President and this administration has been saying all along.

The President has made it clear he wants the U.S. to stay in Iraq permanently. In 1930, they didn't call it occupation, they called it a treaty. And they are doing it all over again.

Here's another example. The Anglo-Iraqi Treaty of 1930 addresses immunity for British forces and unlimited rights to bases and troop movements. And this administration is doing the same thing. People like Jonathan Schwartz on the Web site democrats.com, Internet sites like After Downing Street and newspapers like the Independent have all examined the 1930 document and compared it to current proposals. They conclude the date is different and it is now the U.S. instead of the British Empire.

Seventy-eight years later, the West is again trying to assume control of the Middle East under the guise of protecting them from themselves. In 2003, Donald Rumsfeld addressed U.S. troops in Baghdad and said, "Unlike other armies in the world, you come not to conquer, not to occupy, but to liberate."

In 1917, British General Stanley Maude, addressing Iraqis in Baghdad, said, "Our armies do not come into your cities and lands as conquerors, but as liberators." The only new thing this administration added was that our soldiers would be greeted by flowers. We know that was not true, just as we know the entire basis for the U.S.-led invasion of Iraq was not true.

When the Prime Minister of Iraq the other day said that he wants a timetable for the withdrawal of U.S. forces, the President said no, he wants Americans in Iraq indefinitely.

The calendar may say 2008, but this administration is acting like it's 1930 all over again. A journalist has just

summed it up in a cartoon. There lies Saddam, and the new statue will be the logos of our five favorite oil companies.

If we ignore the lessons of history, we are doomed to repeat the mistakes of history.

THE ANGLO-IRAQI TREATY OF 1930

Treaty of Alliance between His Majesty in respect of the United Kingdom and His Majesty the King of Iraq. Signed at Baghdad, June 30, 1930.

His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland and the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, and His Majesty the King of Iraq, whereas they desire to consolidate the friendship and to maintain and perpetuate the relations of good understanding between their respective countries; and Whereas His Britannic Majesty undertook in the Treaty of Alliance signed at Baghdad on the thirteenth day of January, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-six of the Christian Era, corresponding to the twenty-eighth day of Jamadi-al-Ukhra, one thousand three hundred and forty-four, Hijrah, that he would take into active consideration at successive intervals of four years the question whether it was possible for him to press for the admission of Iraq into the League of Nations; and

Whereas His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland informed the Iraq Government without qualification or proviso on the fourteenth day of September, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-nine that they were prepared to support the candidature of Iraq for admission to the League of Nations in the year one thousand nine hundred and thirty-two and announced to the Council of the League on the fourth day of November, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-nine, that this was their intention; and

Whereas the mandatory responsibilities accepted by His Britannic Majesty in respect of Iraq will automatically terminate upon the admission of Iraq to the League of Nations; and whereas His Britannic Majesty and His Majesty the King of Iraq consider that the relations which will subsist between them as independent sovereigns should be defined by the conclusion of a Treaty of Alliance and Amity:

Have agreed to conclude a new Treaty for this purpose on terms of complete freedom, equality and independence which will become operative upon the entry of Iraq into the League of Nations, and have appointed as their Plenipotentiaries:

His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland, and the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, for Great Britain and Northern Ireland: Lieutenant-Colonel Sir Francis Henry Humphrys, Knight Grand Cross of the Royal Victorian Order, Knight Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, Knight Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, Companion of the Most Eminent Order of the Indian Empire, High Commissioner of His Britannic Majesty in Iraq; and

His Majesty the King of Iraq: General Nuri Pasha al SA'ID, Order of the Nadha, Second Class, Order of the Istiqlal, Second Class, Companion of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, Companion of the Distinguished Service Order, Prime Minister of the Iraq Government and Minister for Foreign Affairs; Who having communicated their full powers, found in due form, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE 1

There shall be perpetual peace and friendship between His Britannic Majesty and His Majesty the King of Iraq.